

THE NATIONAL ERA: WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 28, 1858.

Mr. Bayard, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the protest against the election of the Hon. Graham N. Fitch and the Hon. Jesse D. Bright, candidates in Congress from the State of Indiana, reported a resolution authorizing the sitting members and the protestants to take testimony, &c.

Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill to grant any person who had entered the public lands of the United States one hundred and sixty acres of land out of the public domain, upon condition of occupancy and cultivation of the same for the period therein specified, reported it back without amendment, and moved that it be read a second time, and ordered it for Monday the 8th February next.

Mr. Kirkpatrick submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed, to have directed to pay to Cornelius W. Walker, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, the sum of fifteen cents per one hundred acres for twenty thousand copies of the opinions of the Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Dred Scott; John F. Adams.

The reading of the presentation of a medal to Paulding being taken up, Mr. Doolittle said:

General Walker, as a military adventurer, he should have but little to say. I first hear of him in 1846, when he was sent on an expedition to Somers, where, with a handful of guided followers, he was completely repelled and defeated. Of his second military expedition from the United States, against a Republic with which we are at peace, the history is but too well known to the country. He entered into Nicaragua, and while there, was most successful. For a time he held, or seemed to hold, the power of the Government there; but, by the same means by which he acquired it, the means of the sword—he lost it again. At Rivas he was rescued from the inevitable destruction by the arrival of the U.S. naval force.

For proof of this statement, Mr. D. proceeded to quote from the report of the Secretary of the Navy. Whatever power General Walker had in Nicaragua, was ended upon his surrender at Rivas, whether it was *de jure* or *de facto*.

Mr. D. read several extracts of letters from Senators Yerkes and Molina to the Secretary of State, showing that they felt grateful to this Government for the act of Com. Paulding in arresting Walker. He also argued at some length on the question, whether it was justifiable or not—quoting Paulding and Van Buren to sustain the position that there are cases when it is the duty of an officer to exceed the law, in punishment of a crime against the United States, and to exceed the act therein approved, "for a time he held, or seemed to hold, the power of the Government there; but, by the same means by which he acquired it, the means of the sword—he lost it again. At Rivas he was rescued from the inevitable destruction by the arrival of the U.S. naval force.

For proof of this statement, Mr. D. proceeded to quote from the report of the Secretary of the Navy. Whatever power General Walker had in Nicaragua, was ended upon his surrender at Rivas, whether it was *de jure* or *de facto*.

Mr. D. also read several extracts of letters from Senators Yerkes and Molina to the Secretary of State, showing that they felt grateful to this Government for the act of Com. Paulding in arresting Walker. He also argued at some length on the question, whether it was justifiable or not—quoting Paulding and Van Buren to sustain the position that there are cases when it is the duty of an officer to exceed the law, in punishment of a crime against the United States, and to exceed the act therein approved, "for a time he held, or seemed to hold, the power of the Government there; but, by the same means by which he acquired it, the means of the sword—he lost it again. At Rivas he was rescued from the inevitable destruction by the arrival of the U.S. naval force.

For proof of this statement, Mr. D. proceeded to quote from the report of the Secretary of the Navy. Whatever power General Walker had in Nicaragua, was ended upon his surrender at Rivas, whether it was *de jure* or *de facto*.

Mr. D. also read a parallel between the conduct of Commodore Paulding in this case and that of General Jackson under the administration of Mr. Monroe. In that case, the Administration not only refused to punish General Jackson, but, in the course of his trial, Mr. D. remarked that the only reason he did not appear in the present case was, that instead of sending in a message half of censure and half of apology, the present Administration had not fully and frankly avowed and justified the act of its officer. When he had concluded his remarks,

Mr. Brown moved to amend the joint resolution by striking out all after the enacting clause, and inserting, "That Congress has heard with surprise of the arrest of William Walker and those who aided and abetted him at Potosi, Arica, in the service of the United States, commanding the United States naval squadron, on the 8th day of December, 1857; and seeing that said act was in violation of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power, and not consistent with any law, Congress disowns it and has officially notified the said Paulding acted without instructions from the President or the Secretary of the Navy; Congress expresses its condemnation of his conduct in this regard."

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever." Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

The territory certainly did not belong to the United States; and, as we are not at war with Nicaragua, any of the Central American States, which was a very small territorial sovereign, became an unquestionable foreign territory was invaded by Commodore Paulding. The next proposition was, that the act was not sanctioned by any existing law.

Mr. Brown went to ridicule the assertion that Congress had a voice in the consideration of the conduct of an American officer in the territories of another nation. He did not know but that it would next be proposed to give medals to our army at Salt Lake, if, after all the Mormons have captured it, and the rebels with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

Mr. D. moved that he had no speech to make. What he had to say might as well be said in five or ten minutes, as in so many hours. It would be noticed that in his amendment he spoke of General Walker without the use of any title, and in the terms with him as "persons," and not assigning him as "whatever."

Then he asserted that what was simply a truism, that Congress was surprised on receiving the intelligence that this arrest had been made. Was there any Senator who was not aware of it? The amendment goes on to say that they were witness of the territorial sovereignty of a friendly Power.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

KANSAS AND THE Lecompton CONSTITUTION.
SPEECH OF HON. I. WASHBURN, JR.,
of Maine,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JANUARY 7, 1858.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to say at this time about the neutrality laws or William Walker. I shall speak to-day of Kansas. On the 30th day of May, A. D. 1854, the memorable act, entitled "An Act to organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas," was passed by the Congress of the United States. Among its provisions was the following:

"The Constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the State, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri, which is inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the Territories; and, in all cases, and for all purposes, except in reference to the exclusive legislation of Congress, there shall be no constitutional inhibition to the power of Congress to legislate for the Territories." On the 20th day of May, A. D. 1854, the memorable act, entitled "An Act to organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas," was passed by the Congress of the United States. Among its provisions was the following:

"The Constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the State, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri, which is inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the Territories; and, in all cases, and for all purposes, except in reference to the exclusive legislation of Congress, there shall be no constitutional inhibition to the power of Congress to legislate for the Territories."

This act relates to Slavery in the Territories—to its invention, (for it was a new thing under the sun,) the present Secretary of State, if not to the country, the direful spirit of unnumbered woes, which it has created, and which it has brought with the people of the Territories, resided the right to manage their own affairs, to regulate their social, domestic, and local concerns in their own way.

It was agreed that this right had been practically exercised in the Territories, and that the same was, in effect, in the hands of the people of the Territories.

The power of Congress, in the exercise of its general power in Congress, in that it extends to all proper subjects of legislation in the Territories—the question of Slavery included. And they agree with Senator Douglas and General Cass, that it has no more power over Slavery than they have over other questions of domestic policy and interest.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Republicans hold that, although the legislative power resides, in its exercise, in the Territories, it is not to be exercised in the Territories, but on the other hand, in the hands of the people of the Territories; or, in other words, that Congress may govern through the instrumentality of Territorial Legislatures, whose action, however, is subject to the approval of the President.

They also believe that it is wise and expedient to delegate to the people of the Territories the power to make, or rather, to amend their own laws, and to regulate in regard to Slavery.

They also believe that the intervention of Congress in the Territories, in the exercise of its general power in Congress, in that it extends to all proper subjects of legislation in the Territories—the question of Slavery included. And they agree with Senator Douglas and General Cass, that it has no more power over Slavery than they have over other questions of domestic policy and interest.

The failure to vote, says Governor Walker, is due to the fact that he did not know upon which this provision of the Kansas-Nebraska act was advocated or defended by those who voted for it. I will read some brief extracts from the speeches of leading Democrats made in Congress, while you will be pleased to note that, in this case, the bill was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Territories in the Senate, the Senator from Illinois, Judge DOUGLAS, repeating what he had said on a previous occasion.

"The position that I have often taken has been that this is a question and another question relating to the domestic affairs and domestic policy of the Territories, and that we ought to be content with whatever the people of the Territories do, and that we have no right to interfere with them, and know much better what institutions suit them than we do."

The Secretary of State, Gen. Cass, then a Senator from Michigan, exultingly hailed the triumph of "Southern Sovereignty," when the Nebraska bill passed the Senate. He had previously made an elaborate speech in the Senate, in defense of his bill to prove that the powers of the Territories, as well as of the States, ought to be permitted to determine for themselves in regard to all their local institutions. He said:

"We can see each other's domestic heresies—not their domestic sins; their family and social relations; their wives, nor their children; their men-servants and women-servants; their slaves, and their masters; their property, without a grain of violence in the name of man, condescended by us, or our fathers, and our sons."

The gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. STEPHENS], in his speech, while he was making his bill pass, said that, "I will understand why he desired it might become a law, I will read a short passage from a speech which he made in this House on the 17th of February, 1854."

"Any man, you calling yourselves Democrats from the North, stand up this great question of popular sovereignty, and let me consider the bill to be introduced, and restricting the voice of the people, and, instead of giving them a full and entire voice, and it may be the destruction, of free labor of labor that owns itself, and the destruction of the institution of slavery, and the destruction of the institution of freedom, and the destruction of the institution of property, and the destruction of the institution of man."

The North of the South are willing that they should exercise their right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States."

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds; who represented and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

Still, sir, were the arguments and considerations upon which the friends of the Nebraska bill urged its adoption by Congress. There were, to be sure, a few gentlemen in both Houses who supported and seconded the bill on grounds of popular sovereignty, as advocated by the friends of the bill; but they were not the active and efficient men upon whom efforts its success depended, although they may have given the last touch to its introduction. And it is with a certain fear and trembling that I recollect from any intelligent quarter, that the avowed purpose for which the Nebraska bill, in the shape in which it first assumed, was enrolled upon the Statute book of the United States, to assure to the people of the Territories the right to make such rules and regulations, laws and ordinances, affecting their domestic interests, and all their other character, as they should see fit. Were it not, I might add, an allegation by additional testimony to the same effect, with which I have adduced, it could be found in more than fifty speeches, filling the Appendix of the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for the first session of the Thirty-third Congress.

Such were the reasons assigned for the enactment of the law, its influential and efficient friends, and those of their number who, by their subsequent action in the name of the law, failed to secure to the people the unimpeded exercise of this right, prove that they were really actuated by the motives which they professed, we must admit that they would have fallen into error so grave and so vital. The design of the section of the bill which I have read was, not to give the right to self-government, or the right to exercise it, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents of the bill, however, will say, that the bill, in its original form, did not provide for a republican form of government; and that it did not contain any provision which would afford to the slaves of a slave state, the right